

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 and 5-9 are currently pending. Claims 1, 3, and 7 have been amended and claim 4 has been cancelled.

Applicant acknowledges and appreciates the Examiner's indication that claims 1-3 and 5-9 would be allowed if the objection and the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejections are overcome.

The Examiner objected to claims 1, 3, 4, and 7 for various informalities. Specifically, the Examiner objected to the use of the phrases "attachment surface" and "attachment axis."

As suggested by the Examiner, claim 1 has been amended to exclude the phrase "and an attachment surface" and include only the first and second side of the door. Additionally, "attachment surface" has been replaced by "first side" in the remainder of claim 1.

However, Applicant notes that the use of attachment surface is not indefinite as one of ordinary skill in the art would clearly recognize what is meant by "attachment surface." Applicant has replaced "attachment surface" with "first side" to expedite prosecution. However, the scope of the claim remains unchanged.

Claims 1, 3, and 7 make reference to an "attachment axis", rather than the desired "adjustment axis". Applicant has replaced all instances of "attachment axis" with "adjustment axis". Applicant used "adjustment axis" rather than the suggested "adjusting axis" because "adjustment axis" is discussed in the detailed description (see Page 6 Line 8).

While Applicant has cancelled claim 4, Applicant notes that the subject matter of claim 4 is similar to that of claim 3. Claim 4, as well as claim 3, clearly narrow claim 1. Claim 1 recites that the adjustment axis (190) is parallel to the first side of the door. There exist many possible axes parallel to the first side of the door. Claim 3 further defines the orientation of the adjustment axis to be substantially perpendicular to the latch bolt axis, thus

narrowing the subject matter to a small number of axes that are substantially parallel to the first side of the door and substantially perpendicular to the latch bolt axis.

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the objections.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner rejected the claims because of the use of the phrases “attachment surface” and “attachment axis.”

As discussed above, Applicant has amended claims 1, 3, and 7 to remove these two phrases. As noted, Applicant believes the use of attachment surface is not indefinite and is no different from the use of first side. As such, Applicant has amended the claims as suggested by the Examiner to expedite prosecution of this case.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-3 and 5-9 are in a condition for allowance.

The undersigned is available for telephone consultation during normal business hours.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas J. Otterlee
Reg. No. 48,652

Docket No.: 084554-9174-00
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP
100 East Wisconsin Avenue
Suite 3300
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202-4108
414.271.6560